



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).] 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Yukio Ichikawa	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 6838
09/889,086		07/11/2001		33791	
116	7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
	& GORD		BHATTACHARYA, SAM		
SUITE 1200				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELA	ND, OH	44114-3108	2687		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/889,086	ICHIKAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Sam Bhattacharya	2687		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sam Bhattacharya	2687	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	orrospondonos add	ross
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT		•	ress
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compart following time periods: The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of this Adv. 	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repother the final rejection.	of Appeal. To avoid at offidavit, or other evidence ocompliance with 37 (ly must be filed within	ence, which CFR 41.31; or one of the
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI).	f the final rejection. IRST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the safter the mailing date of the final rejection	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) by reduce any
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>10 August 2005</u>. A bri the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl 	or any extension thereof (37 CFR	41.37(e)), to avoid di	smissal of the
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		because
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	: (PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	,	, timely filed amendm	nent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented.	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		·	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			ince because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	NO(S)	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the limitation of a mobile terminal that has second communication means transmit data for voice communication to an information service center via an on-vehicle terminal main unit, requires further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: with respect to claim 7, the hand set 36 and the cellular phone unit 32 in Yoshida et al. do communicate with each other because the hand set 36 transmits data to the cellular phone unit 32. Moreover the second radio transmission means 35 makes voice communication possible in an emergency relief center from the car by automatic change at the time of the data communication termination by the first radio transmission means 33. See paragraph [0008], lines 15-18. Examiner relies on Tognazzini, not Yoshida, for a teaching of mobile terminal including data retaining means. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The hand set of Yoshida and the portable locator device of Tognazzini are analogous fields of endeavor because both use wireless radio communications. One skilled in the art would therefore have looked to Tognazzini to modify the teachings of Yoshida et al. for the reasons stated in the rejection.

SONNY RINH PRIMARY EXAMINER